

REMARKS:

The Examiner is thanked for the Office Action of July 7, 2003. In response thereto, Applicant elects with traverse Invention II, including claims 18-20. In addition, Applicant has canceled claims 1-17 without prejudice, and added new claims 23-30. No new matter has been added.

Applicant asserts that all of the claims are directed to a method of making a door, the door made therefrom, and the press used to make the door. As such, the same search will be made for all of the inventions, as defined by the Examiner. Restriction is therefore an inefficient approach to prosecuting the present application.

In addition, the Examiner has not provided any specific reasons in support of the restriction requirement. The particular reasons relied on by the Examiner for holding that the inventions as claimed are either independent or distinct should be concisely stated. A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate. The reasons upon which the conclusion is based should be given. (See MPEP §816). In the Office Action, the Examiner merely states that "the product as claimed can be made by a materially different process", and "the apparatus as claimed can be used for pressing a variety of different products." The Examiner fails to provide any particular reasons and/or examples in support thereof.

It is believe that no fee is due with this submission. Should that determination be incorrect, then please debit Account No. 50-0548 and notify the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. C. Schrot', with a stylized flourish at the end.

William C. Schrot
Registration No. 48,447
Attorney for Applicant

Liniak, Berenato & White, LLC
6550 Rock Spring Drive, Suite 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Telephone: (301) 896-0600
Facsimile: (301) 896-0607